

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20031

government of the Dominican Republic incumbent several weeks ago was overthrown. A new government came into control there, but our Government refused to recognize it. In Saigon, the existing government was overthrown, and the indications are that the Government of the United States will recognize the revolutionary government there. Why the difference? Why did our Government give preferential treatment to one and prejudicially discriminatory treatment to the other? That is the important question.

I now read the article:

IT DEPENDS ON WHO IS GETTING COUPED—DOMINICANS RAISE THEIR EYEBROWS OVER SAIGON

(By Hal Hendrix)

MIAMI, November 5.—From the Dominican Republic point of view, last week's bloody military coup d'état in South Vietnam has an inconsistent twist.

"It all depends on who is getting couped and where," commented a Dominican traveler upon arrival here.

The traveler, a source close to the ruling provisional government in Santo Domingo, said it was interesting to Dominican associates that, according to news agency reports, Washington could hardly wait to extend recognition to a provisional regime in Saigon. "But almost 6 weeks have passed since the military staged a coup in Santo Domingo and we are no nearer getting U.S. recognition than we were 6 weeks ago," the source said.

STRANGE

It seems strange to Dominicans—and it must to other Latin Americans—that the United States deplored the military action in Santo Domingo but openly called for a change in Vietnam's government and thereby encouraged the Saigon coup, he said.

The visitor pointed out that Washington officials happily reported that the Vietnam military leaders who overthrew the constitutional government of President Ngo Dinh Diem—and then killed him and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu—were friendly toward the United States and stanchly anti-Communist.

By the same token, the Dominican noted, Dominican military leaders never have been unfriendly toward the United States and are, in fact, strongly pro-United States and anti-Communist.

Furthermore, he added, the Dominican military coup against President Juan Bosch last September 25—in which softness toward communism was an announced factor—was bloodless and government reins were turned over to a civilian triumvirate within 36 hours after the coup.

NONE KILLED

President Bosch was accompanied into exile by an army general (Antonio Imbert) at his own request and none of his government officials was killed or injured in the coup, the traveler reminded.

In Santo Domingo, the visitor said, Dominicans noted with interest news agency reports from Saigon about celebrations following the overthrow of the Diem regime.

It recently was reported in the New York press, he mentioned, that American Peace Corps representatives in the Dominican Interior referred to celebrations in small villages when it was learned Sr. Bosch had been toppled.

Also, the Dominican visitor said, it should be evident now there has been no national clamor in the republic for a return of Sr. Bosch or any of his cohorts, except by remnants of his revolutionary party, the Marxist-Leninist June 14 movement and other leftist elements.

PRIDE HURT

"Obviously," the Dominicans concluded, "the Kennedy administration and its democratic advisers in Puerto Rico had their pride wounded when their man Sr. Bosch was overthrown.

"It is equally obvious that the United States is not engaged in a shooting war against the Communists in our country like it is in Vietnam.

"But, according to the Kennedy administration, the Alliance for Progress is supposed to be a weapon against communism in the Americas. Now they have cut off Alliance-for-Progress programs in the Dominican Republic.

"So you have to ask, if you are a Dominican, Is the Alliance for Progress really for the Latin people or the favored Latin governments?"

Mr. President, to repeat, from the beginning to the end the people of the Dominican Republic were apprehensive that Bosch, the poet, the romanticist, the sentimental, was soft on communism, and they begged him to become firm. Our State Department said to him, "You will run yourself into trouble." But he would not listen, and the people overthrew him. But our Government refused to recognize the revolutionary government there, although the indications are that probably our Government will recognize the revolutionary government in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, in my opinion, there is no difference between the two; but even if there is a difference, it is in favor of the Dominican Republic Government. If our Government recognizes one, then justice, fairness, decency, and security for our country require that our Government give recognition and grant aid to both.

DISMISSAL OF OTTO OTEPKA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today the State Department announced the dismissal of Otto Otepka, a senior, experienced, and extremely competent security officer, because he gave to members of the Senate Judiciary Committee information concerning irregularities and probable illegalities affecting the security of the United States.

I consider the dismissal of Mr. Otepka by the Department of State a serious challenge to responsible government and to the system of checks and balances on which it is based. It is not only a direct affront to the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security; it is also an affront to the Senate as a whole, and is a denial of its powers as established by legislation.

The charges on which Mr. Otepka's dismissal is based boil down to the simple fact that he has testified honestly before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security on matters relating to security in the Department of State.

The right of Government employees to furnish information to them is established by statute. The United States Code, title 5, paragraph 652(d), reads:

(d) The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof, shall not

be denied or interfered with. (As amended June 10, 1948, c. 447, 62 Stat. 345; 1949 Reorganization Plan No. 5, effective Aug. 19, 1949, 14 F.R. 5227, 63 Stat. 1067.)

The State Department, by its action in the Otepka case, has, in effect, nullified this statute and issued a warning to all Government employees that cooperation with the established committees of the Senate, if this cooperation involves testimony considered unpalatable at higher echelon, is a crime punishable by dismissal.

Mr. President, the high significance of the Otepka case cannot be overstated.

Mr. Otepka was the last old-line security officer holding a top position in the Office of Security.

He has been an employee of the U.S. Government for 27 years. He has served as Deputy Director of the Office of Security and officer in charge of evaluations. His efficiency ratings have always been "excellent." In 1958 he received the Meritorious Service Award from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. But suddenly, for some strange reason, certain people in the Department decided that Mr. Otepka had to go.

So they began, first, to restrict his functions.

Then they installed a tap on his telephone. Although a State Department official has denied under oath that this was done, the Subcommittee on Internal Security has proof that the tap was installed.

Then they began to monitor Mr. Otepka's wastebasket.

Then they locked him out of his office and denied him access to his files, although no charge had yet been brought against him.

No one suspected of espionage or disloyalty has to my knowledge been subjected to such surveillance and humiliation.

But Mr. Otepka was not suspected of disloyalty or espionage.

He was suspected very simply of cooperating with the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and of providing it with information that some of his superiors found embarrassing or objectionable.

In the topsy-turvy attitude it has displayed in the Otepka case, the State Department has been chasing the policeman instead of the culprit; and the words "security violation" have come to mean not the act of turning over information to an alien power, but the act of giving information to a committee of the Senate of the United States.

I have asked for an emergency meeting of the full Senate Judiciary Committee to consider the implications of Mr. Otepka's dismissal.

I have also asked that the 10-page memorandum on the Otepka case which I personally delivered to Secretary Rusk in New York, and which was signed by all the members of the Judiciary Committee, be circulated to all the Members of the Senate.

If the dismissal of Mr. Otepka is permitted to stand, it will become impossible or exceedingly difficult to elicit any

20032

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 5

Information from employees of the executive branch that bears on disloyalty, malfeasance, conflict of interest, or other wrongdoing by their superiors.

I hope the Secretary of State will see fit to reverse the decision of the Department when this matter comes to his attention.

Mr. THURMONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for bringing this information to the attention of the Senate.

Does the Senator from Connecticut feel that if this decision of the State Department stands, that it would not only nullify the law on the subject—I refer to the law which requires an employee to state truthfully to a congressional committee the facts within his knowledge about the matter concerning which he is questioned—but that it also would nullify our constitutional system of government, by tending to destroy the constitutional system of checks and balances?

Mr. DODD. Yes. The Senator was not present in the Chamber when at the opening of my remarks I said that I considered it a most serious challenge to the system of checks and balances under which our Government operates. There is nothing more precious than this system. If we are to preserve free government, it must be founded on checks and balances.

If the legislative branch cannot inquire about irregularities or illegalities in Government departments, who will inquire?

Who will question wrongdoing if the legislative branch of the Government cannot do so?

If any Government employee is barred from giving vital information to a congressional committee, Senate or House, how will we ever learn of malfeasance or wrongdoing in the Government.

If the reward for coming forward and honestly telling Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of wrongdoing is dismissal, something terrible has happened in our country, and we had better move before it is too late.

Mr. THURMOND. I believe it was Thomas Jefferson who made a statement to the effect that no man can be trusted with power, but must be bound by the chains of the Constitution. Does the Senator construe that statement to indicate that the purpose in the relevant provisions of the Constitution was to prevent any one man or agency in the Government from becoming too powerful, and to provide that each branch of the Government should be a check on the other branches? In the instance now in question, was not the legislative branch performing its constitutional function of checking on the executive branch by calling before it a witness who was in possession of valuable information which the Congress desired?

Mr. DODD. Yes. That is exactly what happened. That is all the man did. He gave honest information.

Incidentally, I have no doubt of the truth of the testimony; and I do not believe that any member of the committee doubts the truth of it. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. Otepka has not been charged with giving false information. He is charged with giving the truth to a committee of the Senate. Since someone in the Department has been embarrassed, Mr. Otepka has been dismissed for doing so. I cannot think of anything worse.

I try to be temperate about these things.

The difficulty concerning this individual has been going on for some time. There is much more to the story than I have been able to reveal, but in due time I am confident that it will all be made public. I am reluctant to raise the point on the floor of the Senate. I would prefer to see the investigations and hearings go along quietly. They have all been conducted in executive sessions to protect the reputations of people and to be sure of our facts before it is all made public—if it ever is or should be.

Now we are faced with a challenge to the Senate and the House of Representatives. Next the challenge will be presented to, say, the Committee on Commerce, and then, say, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

No committee of the Senate will be safe from interference, if an employee of the Government cannot come before a committee and tell the truth about any situation prevailing in the Government. In my judgment, no more grievous threat to our system of Government has been postured before us in my recollection.

It is not merely a problem for the Committee on the Judiciary or for the subcommittee. It is a problem for the Congress and the American people. That is why I have presented the facts, as I have done this afternoon.

Mr. THURMOND. If Mr. Otepka had not told the truth to the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, would he not then have been guilty of perjury?

Mr. DODD. Of course. Our witnesses have been under oath. I pointed out earlier—and again I am quite sure that the Senator from South Carolina was not present at the time—that we know the Department of State tapped Mr. Otepka's telephone, but an employee of the Department of State came to our subcommittee and, under oath, said that the telephone had not been tapped—which was an untruth. That is the man who ought to be subject to charges. When employees of the Government come before a congressional committee and either make wilful misstatements or tell untruths under oath I believe that dismissal charges should be preferred against them. But up to the present hour the man who has been dismissed is the man who told the truth, and so far as I know, the man who told the untruth has not been moved against.

Mr. THURMOND. Does the commit-

tee have any plans to cite for perjury the man to whom the Senator referred?

Mr. DODD. I have not asked any questions about that. As I said, I asked for an emergency meeting of the Judiciary Committee so that all the implications of the situation might be fully explored and the committee might make a decision with respect to what it should do, how it should advise the Senate, and what it should report to the Senate.

Mr. THURMOND. If this becomes accepted practice, in the future will not a witness called before a committee face one of two courses: If he tells a falsehood, he is subject to being prosecuted for perjury; if he tells the truth, as Mr. Otepka did, he will subject himself to the wrath of his employers, and be in danger of dismissal?

Does that not put an employee of the Government who may be a witness in the difficult position as far as knowing which course he must take—to tell the truth and be subject to dismissal or tell a lie and be subject to being cited for perjury?

Mr. DODD. Of course it does. It is very obvious that it does.

Mr. THURMOND. Should the employees of our Government ever be placed in such a position? Should not the State Department have commended Mr. Otepka for telling the truth, and promoted him because he had the courage to tell the truth and bring those matters to our attention? Instead, the State Department is taking the position that he should be fired because he came before a duly constituted congressional subcommittee and told the truth.

Mr. DODD. Yes. I speak for myself only. I have never considered our function on the subcommittee as an adversary position.

I do not believe that we of the legislative branch should be in an adversary position with respect to the executive or the judicial branch. We are in a cooperative posture. We should be. We should be working together. I tried to conduct myself on the subcommittee in that way. I believe the other members have, too. I know they have. So we are not in a contest. We want to work together. If something wrong is brought to our attention through a Government employee, we want to tell the Secretary of State, the head of whatever department is involved, or the proper officials. Then something could be done about it.

I have never believed that the subcommittee should seek large headlines in an effort to make a case against the executive department. I do not believe that is our task. There has been too much of it in the past. We are a part of the Government, too. We should be working with the other two branches. How can we do so if another branch dismisses an employee who comes before us and tells the truth about a situation in a specific department?

Mr. THURMOND. It is the duty of the subcommittee to make inquiry. That is what I understood the subcommittee did in the present instance. It made a legitimate inquiry during which

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20033

the witness was cross-examined. The witness spoke the truth; and because he spoke the truth he has been fired.

Mr. DODD. That is what happened.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I deeply regret what has occurred. The Secretary of State should consider the question most carefully and reconsider the action which has been taken. He should restore this faithful employee, who has been recognized as a man of character, a man of ability, and a man of dedication, he having been the recipient of an award from the Department of State only a few years ago. There has not been the least criticism concerning his ability, his patriotism, or the manner in which he has performed his duties. Merely because he gave information in response to an inquiry of a congressional subcommittee that someone in the State Department did not like, they have acted to get rid of him.

Mr. DODD. What, if the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] were faced with this situation. The Senator has been carrying on investigations with great dignity and care for some time. In view of this fact, assuming that some situation developed in one of the executive departments as to which the Senator from Arkansas wanted to question an employee of that department, if that employee came before the Senator's committee to testify, would he be fired? The implications are grave.

Mr. THURMOND. How would the Congress ever get the needed information? How can the Government Operations Committee perform its function of making inquiries concerning the operation of the Government if employees in the Government who have facts and knowledge essential to such inquiry and investigation are not allowed to speak the truth and present it to a committee of Congress?

Mr. DODD. I know of no way.

Mr. THURMOND. There is a fundamental principle, involving more than one employee. Is there not a principle involved that could lead to great trouble in the future?

Mr. DODD. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Furthermore, not only could this discourage employees from volunteering information to Congress, but also it could discourage them from testifying if it was known that they were wanted to testify or that their presence would be desired. Is it not the same as virtually saying to Government employees, "Stay away from Congress. You are working for the executive branch, and you have no right to give committees of Congress information, although they ask questions and you are supposed to respond truthfully. And if you do respond truthfully, you are in danger of being dismissed"? As I understand it, that is what happened to Mr. Otepka.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is another horn waiting to impale Mr. Otepka. If, when he was called, he refused to testify, he would be subject to contempt proceedings.

Mr. DODD. Yes; under certain circumstances.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If he testified under oath, and told a falsehood, he would be subject to criminal prosecution. If he testified under oath and told the truth, under this policy which has been followed, he stood to lose his job.

Thus, three horns were awaiting him, and it made no difference in which direction he moved. He was hooked.

Mr. DODD. I believe that is the situation. In fairness to the Secretary of State, who is heavily burdened with great problems, I do not feel that he has had an opportunity to obtain an intimate knowledge of the situation. I strongly feel that if the Secretary had a full opportunity to know all the facts and all the implications, we would not be faced with this situation today. I have the highest regard for the Secretary of State. He is a fair, honest, capable, and decent man in every respect.

I believe the situation has gotten out of his hands, which is understandable to me. In such a large department of Government, with all the Secretary of State has to do, these things "boll up" on him. He does not know about them, perhaps, until the last minute. It does not make the situation any less serious, but in all fairness to the Secretary I would not want it to be understood by Senators, or beyond the walls of the Chamber, that I charge in any respect that the Secretary of State is responsible for this situation. I do not believe he is. I believe it is the people under him who have misled him, or misled his Department, into this situation.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

AID TO YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the able senior Senator from Wisconsin which calls for the elimination of aid of any kind to Communist Yugoslavia.

This resolution is particularly timely because of the effort that is now being made to reinstate favored-nation treatment for Yugoslavia and to create an image of Marshal Tito and of his regime that is completely controverted by the facts.

I have spoken many times in the past in opposition to our program of assistance to Communist nations in terms of its harmful effect on our national and international position.

I am opposed to any form of aid to the Tito regime because of its long, unbroken record of tyranny over its own people, including the mass executions at the close of World War II, the judicial murder of General Mihailovich, the imprisonment of Cardinal Stepinac, and the recent reimprisonment of Milovan Djilas.

I am opposed to it because Tito has consistently lined up with the Soviet Union on foreign policy issues, including Hungary and Cuba.

I am opposed to the extension of any form of aid to Tito because in his posture as a so-called independent Communist he has in effect served as the prime organizer of anti-Western neutralism. Among other things, he was the organizer and ideological leader of the viciously anti-Western conference of neutralist nations in Belgrade in August 1960.

These are the historic reasons for my opposition to the continued folly of aid to Tito.

There are some who will say that this is in the past, and that we must concern ourselves with the present rather than with the facts of history. My answer to those who hold this view is that there has been no break in continuity between the Tito regime of the past and the Tito regime of today. In my remarks today, I propose not to deal with the past, but with five current situations that are relevant to the question of whether we should or should not extend favored-nation treatment to Yugoslavia and assist it in other ways.

There has been far too much self-deception on the subject of Tito and Titoism. I do not say that Tito's vaunted independence of Moscow is a complete fraud; he does enjoy a degree of independence.

But when the chips are down, what is the ultimate significance of this so-called independence?

I believe this question was correctly answered by Paul Underwood in an article entitled "Tito's Neutral Road—Toward Moscow" printed in the New York Times magazine in November 1961, who said:

Tito's basic aim in his association with the nonaligned nations seems to be to form a group of Socialist-minded, essentially anti-Western supporters in preparation for Moscow's expected triumph. Such a backing might enable him to maintain a certain independence and give him continued influence even in a Soviet-dominated world.

This is my first reason for supporting the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

My second reason for opposing aid to the Tito regime is that it is a total dictatorship which not only tyrannizes its own people, but which, at the time of Marshall Tito's visit to this country practiced blackmail against American citizens of Yugoslav origin by threatening reprisals against their relatives in Yugoslavia if they engaged in any anti-Tito demonstration.

I have in my possession a number of letters, with translations, written to people in this country by family members in Yugoslavia. The language of these letters is remarkably similar: They all warn the recipients that their relatives in Yugoslavia will suffer if they take part in "counterrevolutionary" or anti-Tito demonstrations of any kind. Let me quote one of these blackmail letters, written by a Yugoslav mother to her son in America, so that my colleagues may have a better understanding of the nature of this reputedly more benign Communist state:

I must turn to you for very great request, and I ask you this as a mother that you do

20034

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 5

not do anything foolish during the visit of Tito to Washington and New York. You know very well that you have your old parents here who do not have much longer to live. And you know very well how unpleasant it is for us to be called to the police headquarters every hour of the day where they threaten us and warn us of the consequences which can befall us.

You look after yourself because you are young and you know as do the others that your past is clear so don't let anyone talk you into taking the wrong path. I beg you as your mother if you love us at all or think something of us who have remained to live here that you do nothing foolish.

Be good as you were before and think a little of us, you know our nerves are weak and we have no strength for anything let alone this unpleasantness. We are already fighting to live; you know that your father and I live from a pension which is \$15 a month and life is short and therefore do not cause any unpleasantness. Think also of your sister and her children. I hope that you will heed me as you did the last time and that everything will be alright.

Love,

It is interesting to note that this letter was sent to an address where the recipient had not lived for 7 months, although the mother was aware of her son's present address and had in fact sent her last several letters to this address.

The son believes that in this way his mother was signaling to him that the letter was written under duress from the secret police or else that his mother did not intend for him to receive the letter at all.

I shall be happy to provide my colleagues with translations of the other letters if they are interested.

From the scale of the letter writing and from the similarity of the letters, it is clear that what is involved here is a concerted effort by Tito's secret police to exercise pressure on Americans of Yugoslav origin or descent by compelling their relatives in Yugoslavia to write, or sign, form letters to them.

To me there could be nothing more despicable than this blatant effort to coerce and silence American citizens by threatening reprisals against innocent women and children who could in no way be responsible for the activities of their relatives in this country.

A third fact which motivates my opposition to the restoration of favored-nation treatment to Yugoslavia is the continuing effort of the Serbian Orthodox Church authorities in Yugoslavia, obviously acting with the approval and most probably at the instigation of their government, to extend their direct control over the churches of the several hundred thousand Americans of the Serbian Orthodox faith.

This is part of a larger pattern which has involved in recent years an increasing number of visits by Orthodox clergymen who have come to this country from the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Rumania, as well as Yugoslavia.

The Serbian Orthodox clergy from Yugoslavia, on their visits to this country, have made the rounds of the several score Serbian Orthodox parishes; the visiting Rumanian Orthodox clergy have made the rounds of the Rumanian Orthodox parishes; and so on.

Last July, I asked the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security to look into this situation because I felt that there were definite security implications in this obviously concerted effort to subject American Orthodox church organizations to the control of clerical authorities who are, in turn, under the control or influence of their Communist governments.

Among other things, there is preliminary evidence which indicates that this control, to the extent that it exists, has been used to discourage criticism of the Yugoslav-Communist regime and other Communist regimes, to encourage American citizens to believe that the regimes in these countries are essentially decent and deserving of support, and to foster an artificial and unwarranted feeling of loyalty to their ancient homelands, despite the fact that they are now Communist dominated.

At the time, I pointed out that these efforts have encountered very bitter resistance from our citizens of Russian, Serbian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian origin and had already resulted or were threatening to result in open schisms.

The great majority of Americans of the Serbian Orthodox faith were aroused by these actions and, at the 10th National Church Assembly which convened this last August 6 in Libertyville, Ill., they voted to request of the Belgrade Synod that "The future relationship of this Serbian Orthodox diocese for the United States and Canada toward the Serbian Orthodox mother church in Yugoslavia shall be broadly autonomous, in which it shall be united spiritually and liturgically but not subject to any canonical-hierarchical relationship." They further voted that until the relationship between the diocese and the mother church is regulated, no decisions or orders of the Belgrade Synod would be accepted by the Serbian Orthodox churches represented at the conferences.

In taking this stand, they pointed out that the Belgrade Synod is not free since it must make its decisions in collaboration with and with the approval of the so-called Federal Commission for Religious Questions of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia; they claimed that the continued existence of their diocese required a determined struggle against all efforts at Communist infiltration; and they declared that their attitude would be in harmony with the welfare of the United States and Canada.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the complete text of the declaration of the 10th National Church Assembly of the Serbian Orthodox diocese of the United States and Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the decision to reject the authority of the mother church in Yugoslavia was, I know, a most difficult one for Americans of Serbian origin. The orthodox church has played a heroic role in Serbian history and the Serbian people are bound

to it not only by strong ties of faith, but by ties of blood and comradeship in battle extending back through the centuries.

How difficult the decision was is attested to by the fact that they continued to accept the authority of the Belgrade Synod until it openly moved to assert direct hierachal and physical control over them.

As for those American Serbs who have not broken with the authority of the Belgrade Synod and have accepted the bishops appointed by it, I think it should be stated emphatically that, with the possible exception of a handful, there are no Communists among them. They have been motivated not by any sympathy for the Belgrade government but by the profound attachment that all Serbs feel to their mother church.

My fourth reason for opposing the extension of any form of aid to the Communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia is the insidious anti-Western policy pushed by Marshal Tito during his recent tour of Latin America. Tito's prime argument in the several Latin American countries he visited was that blocs and alliances have now become antiquated and that the best possible course for the Latin American countries would be to pursue a policy of neutralism akin to his own. In advocating neutralism in the capitals of Latin America, Tito was indirectly assailing and undermining both the OAS and the Alliance for Progress; he was doing Khrushchev's work far more effectively than Khrushchev could do it himself.

I think it noteworthy that Tito, in his visits to the satellite countries and to the Soviet Union, has not ventured to suggest to his Communist colleagues, as he did to our friends in Latin America, that blocs and alliances serve no useful functions.

I also consider it noteworthy that in Mexico City Tito received a reception which, according to all accounts, dwarfed the receptions accorded to other foreign leaders including President Kennedy.

In building up Tito's reputation by inviting him to our own country, we directly abetted his political effort in Latin America. I am certain that it will not be long before we will rue the consequences of Tito's recent visit to the Western Hemisphere.

The fifth reason for opposing foreign aid or favored-nation treatment for Communist Yugoslavia is the damage that this policy has done to important sectors of American industry.

Last year Congress acted to deprive Yugoslavia and Poland of favored-nation treatment. To date, no action has been taken to comply with this congressional decision.

In our single-minded determination to give aid to Communist Yugoslavia, we have sometimes completely ignored the welfare of American industries and of American workers and American communities who are dependent on these industries.

I call the attention of my colleagues, in particular, to the tragic deterioration of the zinc sheet industry of this country over the past 10-year period, a de-